

**REMARKS**

First, Applicant thanks the Examiner for discussing this case with Applicant's representatives on February 6, 2007. A Statement of Substance of Interview is enclosed herewith. The amendments and arguments discussed during the interview are substantially reflected herein.

As a preliminary matter, the Examiner indicates on pages 2-3 of the Office Action that the Information Disclosure Statement filed on November 17, 2006 fails to comply with the provisions of 37 C.F.R. § 1.97, § 1.98 and MPEP § 609 because a copy of the English translation for each cited document has not been provided. Applicant submits that an English translation of the Chinese Office Action, which cites the documents cited in the IDS, was provided, and therefore the cited documents should be considered. The cited documents in the IDS are referred to in the English translation of the Chinese Office Action as "Reference 1" and "Reference 2".

Claims 15-25 are all the claims pending in the present application. In summary, the Examiner maintains the same rejections as set forth in the previous Office Action, and adds a few new arguments in the *Response to Arguments* section of the Office Action. Specifically, claims 15-25 remain rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, as allegedly failing to comply with the written description requirement. Claims 15-25 remain rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e), as allegedly being anticipated by Colosso (U.S. Patent No. 6,169,976).

**§112, first paragraph, Rejections - Claims 15-25**

Applicant submits that claims 15-25 satisfy 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph.

§102(e) Rejections (Colosso) - Claims 15-22

The Examiner maintains the same rejections of claims 15-22 over Colosso as set forth in the previous Office Action, and adds a few new arguments in the *Response to Arguments* section of the present Office Action.

With respect to independent claim 15, Applicant maintains the arguments set forth in the previous Amendment and, additionally, submits that Colosso does not disclose or suggest at least, “wherein the downloaded content is deciphered based on the generated encryption key,” as recited in amended claim 15. That is, the keys that are mentioned in Colosso are keys that relate to activating the licensed product, which allegedly corresponds to the computer dedicated player; however, these keys do not relate to deciphering downloaded content. At least based on the foregoing, as well as previously submitted arguments, Applicant submits that Colosso does not anticipate claim 15.

Applicant amends independent claims 18, 21 and 22 similar to claim 15 and submits that Colosso does not anticipate independent claims 18, 21 and 22. Applicant submits that dependent claims 16, 17, 19 and 20 are patentable at least by virtue of their respective dependencies.

In view of the above, reconsideration and allowance of this application are now believed to be in order, and such actions are hereby solicited. If any points remain in issue which the Examiner feels may be best resolved through a personal or telephone interview, the Examiner is kindly requested to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

AMENDMENT UNDER 37 C.F.R. § 1.111  
U.S. Application No.: 09/770,225

Attorney Docket No.: Q62215

The USPTO is directed and authorized to charge all required fees, except for the Issue Fee and the Publication Fee, to Deposit Account No. 19-4880. Please also credit any overpayments to said Deposit Account.

Respectfully submitted,


SUGHRUE MION, PLLC  
Telephone: (202) 293-7060  
Facsimile: (202) 293-7860

WASHINGTON OFFICE

**23373**

CUSTOMER NUMBER

Date: March 28, 2007

  
Diallo T. Crenshaw  
Registration No. 52,778